

fw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,763	01/30/2002	Jaap Herman van't Hoff	7913-033	4880

20582 7590 07/25/2003

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1667 K STREET NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

HEPPERLE, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3753

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003

202-942-6570 Marcia Sundeen
703-394-2216 Alapati

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/058,763

Applicant(s)

VAN'T HOFF, JAAP HERMAN

Examiner

Stephen M. Hepperle

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3753

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the bayonet fastener of claim 10 and the recitation of claim 12 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

- A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9 11-21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Eidsmore (5,303,734). Eidsmore shows, along an axis, inlet 20, "bar-shaped" element 68 providing a controllable seal, a ring shaped sealing bellows 42, plunger 44, which forms part of the pressure sensor element 34, gas charged chamber 90, a spring 120 in the space enclosed by the plunger, and outlet 22. The drawings show most components as metal, and the housing is welded together, and since there is no disclosure to the contrary, it is assumed that the device is metal (except for seals, which are hatched differently). The method claims are seen as met by Eidsmore. Regarding claim 9, the inlet and outlet tubes provide means for connection to piping, such as by slipping on a flexible hose or sweating a connection.

It should be noted that the term "bar-shaped" is not understood and should be clarified.

Art Unit: 3753

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 16, and 27 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore (5,303,734). Alternatively, it would have been obvious to make Eidsmore of metal because the use of metal for pressure regulators is notoriously old and well known, and because of the strength metal provides.

Claims 12 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore (5,303,734). It would have been obvious to put any pressure regulator at the end of a pipeline, if desired, if, for example, the intent was to provide a set pressure to a large chamber.

Claims 10 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eidsmore (5,303,734) in view of Rogers. Rogers shows an in-line pressure regulator with a bayonet coupling. It would have been obvious in view of Rogers to provide the Eidsmore device with bayonet couplings to make it faster and easier to make the connections, as well known in the valve arts.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 3753

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 13, and 23-24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of copending Application No. 10/058,764. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because It would have been obvious to use the device recited in above claim 20 in a pipeline in order to provide utility to the device (claims 1 and 23-24). That is to say, a regulator needs to be on a fluid line of some sort in order to have fluid to regulate. With respect to claim 13, it would have been obvious to regulate the pressure to a value lower than the input. A regulator that does not lower the output pressure at some point is not a regulator. The above claim 20 device would perform the method of this application's claim 24.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The other Eidsmore patent is similar, but shows threaded couplings Newton and Thompson show similar regulators.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Hepperle whose telephone number is 703-308-1051. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Rivell can be reached on 703-308-2599. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3753

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7765 for regular communications and 703-308-7765 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0861.


Stephen M. Hepperle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753

SMH

July 23, 2003